

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication No. 07036061A to Aoki et al. (hereinafter “Aoki”). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Aoki and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,476 to Abe et al. (hereinafter “Abe”).

In response to the previous Final Office Action, claim 1 was amended to recite that the coupling line and the common lines are connected and overlie on a same plane. However, the Examiner, in the present Office Action, alleges that the specification provides no support for the new element added to claim 1, and thus rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The Examiner further states that Aoki discloses a vertical plane in which Aoki’s common lines and capacitance lines share, and that Applicant does not provide support for which plane (vertical or horizontal) the claim is drawn. Therefore, the Examiner maintains the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claim 1.

In response, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the coupling line and common lines are connected on the same horizontal plane. Fig. 2 clearly shows that the coupling lines 18A and 18B are on the same horizontal plane as the common lines 16. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification; specifically, in Fig. 2<sup>1</sup>, and on page 11, lines 12 – 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by way of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The figures of the drawing of a patent are a part of its disclosure. Germeshausen v. Hilliard, 201 F.2d 896, 906 (C.C.P.A. 1953).

amendment to claim 1, and respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 1.

Regarding the §102(b) rejection, the Examiner alleges that Aoki, in Figs. 1-3, discloses a liquid crystal device comprising a TFT panel, a counter panel and liquid crystal disposed therein. The Examiner further alleges that Aoki discloses a transparent substrate, a plurality of scanning lines, a plurality of signal lines, a plurality of common lines, an array of pixels and a coupling line, similar to the elements as recited in claim 1. Because the common lines and capacitance lines are connected through the contact holes H in Aoki, the Examiner alleges they may overlie on a same vertical plane.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a plurality of common lines to extend in the row direction parallel to the scanning lines, where the scanning lines and the common lines are formed in a single layer, a coupling line formed in the single layer, where the coupling line connects the common lines, and where the coupling line and the common lines are connected and overlie on a same horizontal plane.

Aoki, as clearly shown in Fig. 1, shows common lines 7 connected to capacitance lines 5 connected through a contact hole H. Therefore, it is clear that the common lines 7 and capacitance lines 5 in Aoki cannot be on a same plane. The present invention connects the common lines and coupling line so that a contact hole is not necessary as is required by Aoki, and that the common lines and coupling line are connected and overlie on a same horizontal plane.

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference, disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. Lindeman Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458; 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 485

(Fed. Cir. 1984). As Aoki fails to teach the elements of independent claim 1, as discussed above, it is respectfully requested that the §102(b) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn, and that claim 1 be allowed.

Turning to the §103(a) rejection of dependent claim 10, it must be noted that the Examiner relies on Aoki, in combination with Abe, to support the asserted rejection. As set out above, Aoki does not disclose all the elements of independent claim 1. Accordingly, since dependent claim 10 recites additional unique elements and/or limitations, claim 10 remains patentable over the asserted combination since the cited additional reference does not supply the elements missing from Aoki with respect to the independent claim. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the §103(a) rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn, and respectfully requested that claims 1 and 10 be allowed.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Aasheesh V. Shravah  
Registration No. 54,445

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343

AVS:jap